UBGS MINUTES

To: UBGS Members
From: Jeanne Hossenlopp
Date: 11-11-10
Re: University Board of Graduate Studies
Approved Minutes of the November 11, 2010 UBGS Meeting

Present: Jay Caulfield, Ed Fallone, Robert Griffin, Kim Halula, Arthur Hefti, Jeanne Hossenlopp, Ed Inderrieden, Mike Johnson, Sarah Knox, Stephen Merrill, Jim South
Excused: Margaret Bull, Stephen Guastello, Albert Rivero
Also Present: Melody Baker (note taker), Erin Fox, Tim Melchert, Craig Pierce, Ruth Ann Belknap, NURS (sub for M. Bull), Lawrence Pan, Paula Papanek

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. and the agenda was approved.

Reports
Report from the Committee Chair:
Dr. Griffin reported that Dr. Gary Meyer has posted the Graduate Student Learning Outcomes to a website but has requested the preamble that goes with them. It was recalled that Dr. Tom Taft did draft a preamble for the outcomes a couple of years ago and this should be located.

Report from the Graduate Dean:
Dr. Hossenlopp reported that meetings with departments reviewed by NSF have gone well so far and she will meet with the psychology departments next.
She asked Dr. Melchert to share with the board the progress that has been made on making more information available about external fellowships for students. He reported that a series of webpages has been developed that provides information and resources to encourage and assist graduate students interested in pursuing fellowships and scholarships. These webpages are currently being reviewed by relevant faculty and offices and a series of workshops is being planned.
Lastly, Ms. Fox reported on Wellness Series workshops for graduate students. Although the workshops were very well done, due to poor attendance, the workshops may be discontinued.

Report from the Graduate Assistant Dean:
Mr. Pierce reported that the new viewbooks are now available, thanked everyone who everyone who helped, asked for any feedback people may have. PDF versions are available on the web and can be sent to prospective students electronically at no cost.
Mr. Pierce also distributed a new INPR proposal today and asked for three members that would be willing to serve on a subcommittee. A member who is on the committee for this proposal gave an explanation of the topic at Mr. Pierce’s request. The following members agreed to serve on the subcommittee if presentation of this proposal to the UBGS can be put off until January: Ed Inderrieden, James South, and Sarah Knox.

Unfinished Business
Department of Physical Therapy - Proposal for Graduate Education in Clinical and Translational Rehabilitation Health Sciences:
Dr. Papanek and Dr. Pan joined the meeting (the members had read the latest version of the proposal ahead of time). Questions that members asked were:

Q. Learning outcomes appear the same?
A. Dr. Papanek said this has since been revised.

Q. Why are Athletic Department employees excluded from the program?
A. Dr. Pan explained that they were not allowed to use revenue from tuition remission for this proposal.

Q. Does this apply to children of faculty?
A. Drs. Pan and Papanek are not sure.

Q. There is no increase in faculty proposed. Will this put a crunch on teaching loads?
A. Dr. Pan said some faculty will be compensated for extra teaching. There is a full time teaching line in the proposal that will help also. The department also expects to get some help from graduate students who can teach at the undergraduate level.

Q. PSYC 8101 listed on pg. 16 was questioned.
A. Dr. Papanek said this has been changed to a math course.

An alternative option for restricting tuition remission for just the first three years was discussed.

It was also pointed out that tuition rates should be corrected to $905 for AY 10-11 (pg. 31). Drs. Pan and Papanek were dismissed and a motion was made to approve the recommendation of this proposal with the full support of the UBGS, and seconded. A vote was taken and passed unanimously.

Additional discussion continued on the issues of restricting tuition remission and the board indicated that there were problems with this as a general strategy to meet revenue targets. Further clarification about policies and procedures on this issue is needed. (Note: In follow-up to the UBGS discussion, the restriction was removed in the final version of the proposal that went to the University Academic Senate.)

*Survey on Graduate Students* (any questions from last month’s attachment?) – no questions.

**New Business**

*INPR criteria for faculty committee members and timeline for proposal submission* –

Some conflicting statements on page 6 of this document were pointed out. It was recommended that item 2 under the Qualifications for the Advisor (p. 6) be revised to clarify the sustained research activity that dissertation advisors need to possess.

One member asked if individual program requirements should be used instead of this document, but the problem with that is that not all units are PhD granting units and wouldn’t have written requirements. It was noted that there is no down side to the Chair having more rigorous requirements; rather, it is beneficial to the student and it is important to be sure committee members are qualified. The following motion was made as a substitute for the previous wording included in item 2: “Must have competence in the proposed domain area and hold a terminal degree in his/her discipline. The chair must also be an active scholar with a sustained research program. This is normally evidenced by having published at least three refereed articles/book chapters or one scholarly book within the past five years.”

Also, it was agreed to change #5 to replace “Members” with “Subject area experts” (who do not meet the criteria may ...). This was passed by acclamation.
In the next section (p. 6) under Qualifications for Committee Members, item #4, it was recommended that dissertation committee members should be held to standards that are similar to those used for the dissertation advisor. In discussion it was agreed that this was for the protection of students and reputation of the university. Opinion was also expressed that junior faculty should have the opportunity to serve, and the standards should not prevent that. A motion was made to substitute the following language for item #4: Committee members who are faculty members from Marquette or from another university must have competence in the proposed domain area, hold a terminal degree in their discipline, and should be active scholars with a record during the past five years of at least three refereed articles/book chapters or one scholarly book. A vote was taken and the motion passed unanimously.

**30 Day Notice of Public Defense** –

The intent of this notice is to make a dissertation defense public. However, students sometimes have difficulty getting faculty to agree on the date. Dr. Hossenlopp asked the members if they would consider shortening the time frame. Some members feel that with today’s media, 30 days is unnecessary. Notices are posted on a webpage, and only some departments send paper announcements. One thing to consider is how much time committees need to read the document before the defense. This should be decided by departments; once faculty have had a chance to read the dissertation, the defense can happen anytime. The Graduate School will take these comments into consideration. Also a look needs to be taken at what other schools do.

*Send agendas to Deans, Chairs, DGS’s with list of UBGS reps?*

Dr. Hossenlopp would like to make the UBGS agendas public to department chairs, DGS’s, and deans so they have a chance to voice concerns to their UBGS reps. The members are in favor and would like the same idea suggested to UBUS.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40pm